

NO GUESS WORK

STANDARD DISPATCHES ARE GENUINE AND GUARANTEED BY THE GREATEST NEWS GATHERING ASSOCIATION IN THE WORLD, THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR—NO. 8

The Ogden Standard

OGDEN CITY, UTAH, SATURDAY EVENING, JANUARY 9, 1909

WEATHER FORECAST

UTAH—THE INDICATIONS ARE THAT THE WEATHER WILL BE PARTLY CLOUDY TONIGHT; RAIN OR SNOW AND COLDER TOMORROW.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

TILLMAN TO HOIST ROOSEVELT WITH HIS OWN PETARD, SO HE CLAIMS

Valuable Papers Are Extracted From the Senator's Desk, Bearing on the Land Frauds—Congressmen and Senators Remain Away From the White House—Much Feeling Is Exhibited in the House

Washington, Jan. 9.—In the preparation of his speech in reply to the President's charges, Senator Tillman has failed to find a number of papers bearing upon the Oregon land case in connection with which the present controversy arose. These papers were, he says, enclosed in a large envelope, and left in his private desk in his committee room at the capitol when he left Washington last March on account of his illness, but they cannot now be found.

The senator does not charge that the papers have been abstracted by a government detective who may have been shadowing him, but does say that it would have been possible for any such official to gain access to his room and to his desk, both of which were fastened with only ordinary locks.

The papers, he says, are very important in the preparation of his case and would go far to substantiate his defense. Notwithstanding the loss, Mr. Tillman expresses confidence in his ability to make satisfactory reply to the President.

"He will be hoisted by his own petard," declared Mr. Tillman sentimentally.

Washington, Jan. 9.—That the house does not intend to stop with its action of yesterday in rebuking the President, in connection with his strictures regarding the secret service, was evidenced today when, at the instance of Mr. Tawney of Minnesota, and without a dissenting vote, it adopted a sweeping resolution of inquiry into the amount of money appropriated for the present fiscal year for detecting frauds and the efforts made to bring to trial offenders against the law.

The resolution called for the appointment of a commission of five members to conduct the investigation and to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths. The sum of \$5,000 was appropriated.

It is understood that there will be nothing further from the President on the matter of the secret service resolution adopted by the house yesterday.

The list of Saturday callers from congress usually is large, but today there were only four representatives to see the President, two of these to introduce friends. The callers from the senate were also few.

OLD LIBERTY BELL MAY CROSS THE CONTINENT

EFFORTS ARE BEING MADE IN THIS DIRECTION.

It is Desired for Celebration of Restoration of San Francisco, Rose Festival, Portland, Seattle-Alaska-Yukon Fair.

San Francisco, Jan. 9.—An effort to bring the historic liberty bell from its place in the tower of Independence hall, Philadelphia, to become a feature of the great festival and celebration of the restoration of this city, which is to take place on May 1st, and later to be displayed at the Seattle-Alaska-Yukon exposition are being made by the Maximilian club of this city, working in conjunction with Seattle and Portland men. The Million club executive committee, at its meeting today, decided that the request of the three Pacific coast cities would be at once transmitted to the mayor and supervisors of Philadelphia.

The famous bell has been out of Philadelphia only twice since it was first installed there in colonial days, once when it was taken to the Columbian exposition at Chicago, and again, when at the personal application of President McKinley, it was sent on a triumphal tour of the southern states.

SINGERS REFUSE TO PAY DUTY ON THEIR COSTUMES

New York, Jan. 9.—On top of Oscar Hammerstein's coming troubles in Philadelphia comes additional difficulties here through a dispute between some of Mr. Hammerstein's grand opera singers and the United States customs authorities. It is asserted by customs officers that several of the singers have failed to pay duty on imported costumes and that drastic action will be taken unless the money is forthcoming. The amount owed is said to be in the neighborhood of \$2,000, but as the costumes are in the possession of the singers, they must maintain that neither will they pay, nor give them up. This stand has been taken in spite of urging on the

part of Mr. Hammerstein that the duty be paid.

Miss Doria, one of Mr. Hammerstein's leading contraltos, declared she would go to jail rather than pay.

"I consider it an outrage," said Miss Doria. "I have worn all my costumes and after they had passed the custom house and into my possession I get a bill for \$350. I told the inspector only yesterday that I would go to jail rather than pay such an unjust tax. He gave me until today to pay and told me that if I did not pay then he would take me to the fols. But I shall never pay."

The statement follows:

Loans, \$1,297,035.70; increase, \$23,815.00.

Deposits, \$1,353,349.80; increase, \$37,482.20.

Circulation, \$50,254.40; decrease, \$106.70.

Legal tender, \$83,151,000; increase, \$3,602.90.

Specie, \$279,129.40; increase, \$7,562.30.

Reserve, \$362,280.40; increase, \$11,166.20.

Reserve required, \$339,587.45; increase, \$9,370.55.

Surplus, \$22,692.95; increase, \$1,735.60.

Ex-United States deposits, \$24,890.75; increase, \$1,740.45.

The percentage of actual reserve of the clearing house banks today was 27.08. The statement of banks and trust companies of Greater New York, not members of the clearing house, shows that these institutions have aggregated deposits of \$1,145,493,800, total cash on hand \$112,301,100, and loans amounting to \$1,056,502,900.

Union City, Jan. 9.—Judge Jones today imposed the death penalty on Garrett Johnson, T. Burton, Bob Ransom, Fred Pincon, Arthur Cloar and Sam Applewhite, the night-riders who were found guilty of the murder of Captain Quentin Ranken, and sentenced Bud Morris and Bob Huffman, the two other defendants, to twenty years' imprisonment. The attorneys for the defense immediately gave notice of an appeal to the state supreme court. If this tribunal does not interfere, the first named, six men, will be hanged on February 19.

In applying to Judge Jones today for a new trial, the defense attacked the competency of Jurors McKinney and Ahnke, asserting that they had expressed opinions as to the guilt of the three defendants. After having heard the testimony of three witnesses introduced by the defense in their effort to prove that Juror McKinney had expressed an opinion as to the guilt of the convicted men, the state proved by the members of the jury that he insisted on mitigating circumstances being included in the verdict.

The contentions in regard to Jurors Rosson and Ahnke were later withdrawn and the motion for a new trial was quickly overruled.

Judge Jones listened attentively to the testimony, and at the conclusion, said the court was firmly of the opinion that all evidence introduced at the trial was competent. Judge Jones continued:

"I said some time ago to the grand jury that it was a sad, sad day, when these men left their quiet homes; that their wives had not taken them around the neck and pleaded with them for God Almighty's sake to stop and not make themselves together for such unholy acts, that the case is bristling with perjury, and the jury has returned into this court a verdict against Bud Morris and Bob Huffman of murder in the second degree which must stand."

"The jury has also returned a verdict in the first degree against six of the defendants, and in view of the manner in which the life of Captain Ranken was taken, I can see no mitigating circumstances in their crime. It was not done in the heat of passion and has none of the elements of mitigating circumstances and that part of the verdict will be disregarded."

After a moment's breathless silence the court said:

"But Morris, you will stand up."

"It is the opinion that you be incarcerated in the penitentiary for twenty years and be deprived of your rights of franchise."

Bob Huffman next received the same sentence.

Judge Jones, after a pause, continued:

"Garrett Johnson, you have been tried on a charge of murder in the first degree. A motion for a new trial is overruled by the court. It is considered, and the judgment of the court is, that you will be remanded to jail until Friday, the nineteenth of February, 1909, when you will, by the sheriff of this county, be hanged by the neck until you are dead, and may God have mercy on your soul."

The same judgment was pronounced on the remaining five defendants, convicted of first degree murder.

Perfect silence prevailed in the courtroom during the pronouncing of the sentences. The defendants, each in turn, arose pale and worn, and received the words of judgment.

The court directed the sheriff to see that the defendants be carefully looked

ed after and a proper guard be supplied.

WEEKLY STATEMENT OF CLEARING HOUSE BANKS

New York, Jan. 9.—The statement of the clearing house banks for the week show that the banks hold \$22,692,950 more than the requirements of the 25 per cent reserve rule. This is an increase of \$1,725,650 in the proportionate cash reserve as compared with last week.

The statement follows:

Loans, \$1,297,035.70; increase, \$23,815.00.

Deposits, \$1,353,349.80; increase, \$37,482.20.

Circulation, \$50,254.40; decrease, \$106.70.

Legal tender, \$83,151,000; increase, \$3,602.90.

Specie, \$279,129.40; increase, \$7,562.30.

Reserve, \$362,280.40; increase, \$11,166.20.

Reserve required, \$339,587.45; increase, \$9,370.55.

Surplus, \$22,692.95; increase, \$1,735.60.

Ex-United States deposits, \$24,890.75; increase, \$1,740.45.

The percentage of actual reserve of the clearing house banks today was 27.08. The statement of banks and trust companies of Greater New York, not members of the clearing house, shows that these institutions have aggregated deposits of \$1,145,493,800, total cash on hand \$112,301,100, and loans amounting to \$1,056,502,900.

Union City, Jan. 9.—Judge Jones today imposed the death penalty on Garrett Johnson, T. Burton, Bob Ransom, Fred Pincon, Arthur Cloar and Sam Applewhite, the night-riders who were found guilty of the murder of Captain Quentin Ranken, and sentenced Bud Morris and Bob Huffman, the two other defendants, to twenty years' imprisonment. The attorneys for the defense immediately gave notice of an appeal to the state supreme court. If this tribunal does not interfere, the first named, six men, will be hanged on February 19.

In applying to Judge Jones today for a new trial, the defense attacked the competency of Jurors McKinney and Ahnke, asserting that they had expressed opinions as to the guilt of the three defendants. After having heard the testimony of three witnesses introduced by the defense in their effort to prove that Juror McKinney had expressed an opinion as to the guilt of the convicted men, the state proved by the members of the jury that he insisted on mitigating circumstances being included in the verdict.

The contentions in regard to Jurors Rosson and Ahnke were later withdrawn and the motion for a new trial was quickly overruled.

Judge Jones listened attentively to the testimony, and at the conclusion, said the court was firmly of the opinion that all evidence introduced at the trial was competent. Judge Jones continued:

"I said some time ago to the grand jury that it was a sad, sad day, when these men left their quiet homes; that their wives had not taken them around the neck and pleaded with them for God Almighty's sake to stop and not make themselves together for such unholy acts, that the case is bristling with perjury, and the jury has returned into this court a verdict against Bud Morris and Bob Huffman of murder in the second degree which must stand."

"The jury has also returned a verdict in the first degree against six of the defendants, and in view of the manner in which the life of Captain Ranken was taken, I can see no mitigating circumstances in their crime. It was not done in the heat of passion and has none of the elements of mitigating circumstances and that part of the verdict will be disregarded."

After a moment's breathless silence the court said:

"But Morris, you will stand up."

"It is the opinion that you be incarcerated in the penitentiary for twenty years and be deprived of your rights of franchise."

Bob Huffman next received the same sentence.

Judge Jones, after a pause, continued:

"Garrett Johnson, you have been tried on a charge of murder in the first degree. A motion for a new trial is overruled by the court. It is considered, and the judgment of the court is, that you will be remanded to jail until Friday, the nineteenth of February, 1909, when you will, by the sheriff of this county, be hanged by the neck until you are dead, and may God have mercy on your soul."

The same judgment was pronounced on the remaining five defendants, convicted of first degree murder.

Perfect silence prevailed in the courtroom during the pronouncing of the sentences. The defendants, each in turn, arose pale and worn, and received the words of judgment.

The court directed the sheriff to see that the defendants be carefully looked

ed after and a proper guard be supplied.

Washington, Jan. 9.—Under the terms of an anti-nuptial agreement ten years ago at Washington, D. C., and filed today in St. Louis, Mrs. August Knight, widow of a millionaire shoe manufacturer of Chicago, is deprived of her dower rights in the estate amounting to nearly a million dollars and is cut off with an annual allowance of \$3,000, the income to cease with her death. Knight died two years ago.

Mrs. Knight was the second wife of August Knight and before her marriage was Miss Katherine Bayne Bradley, a society girl of Philadelphia.

Nyack, N. Y., Jan. 9.—Harry K. Thaw is entitled to a trial on the question of whether he has recovered his sanity, according to Justice Tompkins, who today heard arguments on a writ of habeas corpus obtained by Mrs. Mary C. Thaw, his mother. In applying for the writ, Mrs. Thaw declared that Harry K. Thaw was not a criminal, having been acquitted by a jury and that he is now sane and should not be in prison. Thaw was brought down from the Matteawan asylum today to be present at the hearing. He was represented by Charles Morschauer, District Attorney of New York county, who was present and also a hired lawyer. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.

Justice Tompkins said that Thaw was entitled to a trial to determine whether he had recovered his sanity and was safe to be at large, but reserved decision as to where the trial should be held. He remarked Thaw was the asylum inmate. Upon Mr. Morschauer's objection on the ground that Thaw's counsel was not well treated at the asylum, court ordered that Mr. Morschauer should be able to see Thaw alone at any time.